

very general findings of CEAP:CBP

Gary Shenk

to:

Kelly Shenk

10/06/2010 09:25 AM

Show Details

History: This message has been replied to.

These are my conclusions based on my analysis only. They haven't been discussed with others. We're all still crunching data.

1. The percent of TN, TP, and TSS from cropland in the CB watershed are consistent between CEAP and CBP to within a few percentage points.
2. Both efforts ran a 'No Practice', 'current practice', and 'fully treated' run.
3. For TSS, CEAP and CBP are in general agreement as to the percent reduction accomplished so far and the amount of available reduction
4. For TP, CEAP and CBP are in agreement that the current practice run is about half way between the 'no practice' and 'fully treated' runs, although the CEAP study finds that practices have about twice the overall effectiveness as CBP.
5. For TN, CEAP and CBP are in agreement on the available reduction, but CEAP has a higher estimate of reductions already made.

There are at least three major reasons for any di

1. Differences in scenario definitions. We are cu
  2. Differences in the numb  
However all practices are  
complete, but may detail p
  3. CBP reductions are bas
- CBP  
ffectiv  
an fully functional.  
from the literature, for the most part. CBP only directly  
hered data which may be incomplete.  
farmer surveys which are more
- simulates land use and nutrient application differences. CEAP is directly modeling all practices.

	CEAP	CBP	CEAP	CBP	CEAP	CBP	CEAP	CBP
	TN	TN	TP	TP	TSS	TSS	Acres	Acres
Percent CC	30%	28%	25%	22%	26%	33%	10%	8%
Reduction								
accomplished	12%	5%	12%	7%	13%	14%		
Reduction available	17%	16%	15%	8%	8%	9%		

Gary Shenk  
Integrated Analysis Coordinator  
EPA / Chesapeake Bay Program Office  
410 Severn Ave  
Suite 112  
Annapolis MD 21403